

## **REMARKS**

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the claimed invention is respectfully requested in view of the amendments, remarks and enclosures herewith, which place the application in condition for allowance.

### **I. STATUS OF CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS**

With entry of this amendment, claims 1, 2, 5-14, and 16-23 would be pending in this application.

The element of previously presented claim 2 have been added to claim 1. The elements of previous claims 6 and 9 have also been added to claim 1 (see e.g. Figures 1-3 of the applicants' specification for support – see also new claim 23 for a recitation that the second control element is uncovered). In addition, the phrase “with a layer of material impermeable to the volatile substances” has also been added to claim 1, support for this phrase can be found e.g. in paragraph [0048] in the publication of this application (U.S. Pat. Appl. Publ. 2006-0016905).

New claims 18-22 have been introduced which further defines the nature of the second control element; support for these elements can be found throughout the specification, e.g. paragraphs [0046-0047] in the publication of this application (U.S. Pat. Appl. Publ. 2006-0016905). No new matter has been added by this amendment.

It is submitted that the claims, herewith and as originally presented, are patentably distinct over the prior art cited in the Office Action, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112. The amendments of the claims, as presented herein, are not made for purposes of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §§§§ 101, 102, 103 or 112. Rather, these amendments and additions are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

### **II. THE 35 U.S.C. 103(a) REJECTION HAS BEEN OVERCOME**

Claims 1-14, 16 and 17 were rejected as allegedly being obvious by Paul (U.S. Patent 5,556,030). The applicants request reconsideration of this rejection for the following reasons.

While the applicants disagree with the characterization of the Paul reference in the final rejection, the above amendments to claim 1 have been made in order to advance prosecution. The applicants reserve the right to further pursue the scope of the originally filed claims in a continuing application.

Paul differs from the applicants' claims as amended in that Paul does not teach or suggest that the reservoir is covered on its top face with a layer of material impermeable to the volatile substances, i.e. what is being interpreted as being equivalent to the applicants' first control element from within the Paul reference is on *both sides* of Paul's reservoir; elements (50) and (55) are mirror images which surround the "reservoir" in the teachings of Paul and are both permeable membrane layers.

Paul also differs from the applicants' claims in that there is no teaching that there is joint action between the first and second control elements of the applicants' claimed dispenser to control the dispensation of the at least one volatile substance. The user in Paul, even when accepting the position that element (22) of Paul is a control element, controls the dispensation of the volatile substance by pulling off the sealing strips, i.e. only the first control element in Paul has any effect in dispensing the volatile substance.

In contrast, for the applicants' claimed dispenser, the second control element acts as a means for controlling the size of the surface of the first control element and as such the dispensing of the volatile substance is a result of a joint action between the first and second control elements.

Further still, Paul does not teach or suggest that:

- (1) the second control element is open-pore foam or is a web material (claims 18 and 19);
- (2) the second control element is uncovered in new claim 23 unlike the "control element" of Paul (The assertion presented in the "Response to Arguments" section of the final rejection which stated that element (22) of Paul is a "control element" is believed to be in error. However, even the final rejection acknowledges that such an assertion is true only when combined with the flap (51) of Paul which has to be removed to dispense the scent.)

Therefore, the applicants' claims as amended are not obvious as all of the applicants' claimed elements are not taught and suggested by the Paul reference.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the remarks and amendments herewith, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application and prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited. The undersigned looks forward to hearing favorably from the Examiner at an early date, and, the Examiner is invited to telephonically contact the undersigned to advance prosecution. The Commission is authorized to charge any fee occasioned by this paper, or credit any overpayment of such fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,  
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By: /Howard C. Lee/  
Marilyn M. Brogan     Howard C. Lee  
Reg. No. 31,223     Reg. No. 48,104  
Telephone:     (212) 588-0800  
Facsimile:     (212) 588-0500